UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,737	07/07/2003	John A. Hicks III	BS02499/ATTWP290USB	6215

55343 7590 03/17/2009

AT&T Legal Department - AT
Attn: Patent Docketing
Room 2A-207
One AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921

EXAMINER	
KASRAIAN, ALLAHYAR	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2617	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/17/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/614,737	HICKS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ALLAHYAR KASRAIAN	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 November 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. The present Office Action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on 11/21/2008. **Claims 1-22** are now pending in the present application. **This Action is made FINAL**.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 11/21/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On the second paragraph of page 8 of the Applicant's arguments/remarks, Applicant argues, "Nowhere does Rogalski et al. disclose wherein the wired data network is operative to provide information of at least one subscriber to the voice and data services. In contrast, the claimed invention discloses a first wired data network portion providing a home location register that maintains information about each subscriber to the provided voice and data services. Further at the cited portions, Rogalski et al. provides for utilizing the broadband services as a virtual PSTN network." Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant for several reasons. First, Examiner notes that the amended limitation is indefinite and vague (see rejection under 35 USC § 112). The limitation has different interpretation than what Applicant describes. Second, the limitation has nothing to say regarding the *home location register that maintains information about each subscriber* <u>*to the provided voice and data services*</u>. Third, the Applicant's description and interpretation of the indicated limitation is also different than what it defines on the specification. On page 9, lines 19-26, of the specification, it

states, "the first portion 208 may provide a home location register (HLR) 214 that *maintains information for each subscriber to the voice and data services provided to the digital cordless handsets* 104. The information may include identification information for the user that may be used *to verify the legitimacy of an attempt to access the service* and may also *store an identification of the features applicable for each legitimate user*." The described HLR of the instant application does not provide more functionality than what conventional HLR does (which is well-known to a person of ordinary skill in the art). Fourth, the feature of the limitation (based on broad interpretation by Examiner) is inherently taught by Rogalski. On par. 0023 and 0024, Rogalski discloses "VDG 510 is also connected to wired data terminal 540 (e.g., a personal computer), wireless data terminal 550 (e.g., a wireless laptop computer), and hybrid data/voice terminal 560 (e.g., a cordless handset). Additional terminals (e.g., cordless handset 570) can be configured to communicate with VDG 510… VDG 510 automatically determines if a PSTN connection is available and determines if broadband network 530 supports data only or data with voice services." Since VDG provides data or voice (or both) services to users with different features, it could identify which user needs the type of specific service.

In response to the Applicant's arguments on pages 10 to 11 of the Applicant's arguments/remakes with respect to claim 14, Examiner addresses to the same analogy used for claims 1 and 8. The feature of the limitation (based on broad interpretation by Examiner) is inherently taught by Jones. Gateway 10 identifies the user and based on the user specific type provides the services to the user.

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to the limitation "facilitating or providing outgoing and incoming calls to the digital cordless handset through the wired data network, based on a verification of a subscriber and service provider identification, wherein the cordless handset comprises the subscriber identification and the associated service provider identification" of claims 1, 8 and 14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection (even tough the features is well-known in the art).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. **Claims 1, 8 and 14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 8 and 14 are vague and indefinite because they recite, "the wired data network is operative to provide information of at least one subscriber *to the voice and data services*." It is unclear how the information of a subscriber is provided to voice and services! For sake of applying prior art examiner interprets the limitation as "the wired data network is operative to provide information of at least one subscriber based on the provided voice and data services."

Claims 2-7, 9-13 and 15-22 are also rejected by the virtue of their dependency on **claims 1, 8 and 14** respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the Examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the Examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. **Claims 1, 3, and 7-9** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Rogalski et al. (U.S. Patent Application Pub. # 2004/0141484 A1)** (hereafter Rogalski) in view of **Kallio (U.S. Patent Application Pub. # 2002/0147008 A1)**.

Consider **claim 1**, Rogalski clearly shows and discloses a system for providing voice and data services over a wired data network and over a regulated wireless network, the system comprising:

a first wireless network (FIG. 5 for system 500) including at least one wireless access point (FIG. 5 for voice data gateway 510) wired to the wired data network, wherein the wired data network is operative to provide information of at least one subscriber to voice and data services, (FIG. 5, par. 0023-0024 for broadband data with voice service 530 and consider data gateway 510 as a subscriber's gateway), the at least one wireless access point being operative to provide wireless access to the wired data network over an unregulated wireless connection (see FIG. 5 and lines 11-13 par. 0029 as indication of using WLAN standard as the wireless access point 510); and

at least one digital cordless handset for communicating with the at least one wireless access point via the unregulated wireless connection in order to access the voice and data services (FIG. 5 for cordless handsets 560, 570 and lines 3-4 of par. 0029; also lines 7-9 of par. 0031 should be considered as indication of using unregulated wireless connection of WLAN, “a WLAN system and a cordless telephony system since both of these systems operate in the same band (i.e., the 2.4 GHz band)…”).

However, Rogalski fails to clearly disclose facilitating outgoing and incoming calls to the digital cordless handset through the wired data network, based on a verification of a subscriber and service provider identification, wherein the cordless handset comprises the subscriber identification and the associated service provider identification.

In the same filed of endeavor, Kallio discloses facilitating outgoing and incoming calls to the digital cordless handset through the wired data network (par. 0025, lines 27-42), based on a verification of a subscriber and service provider identification (par. 0025, lines 35-42 and 51-52 for LAC identifier which is considered as service provider identifier and AuC for identifying the subscriber; par. 0029 WMC for confirming the identify of the user), wherein the cordless handset comprises the subscriber identification and the associated service provider identification (par. 0024 for SIM card or chip for confirming the identity of the user; par. 0007 for multi-mode phone to access DECT; it is well-known in the art that the SIM card includes (stores) the associated service provider identification (International Mobile Subscriber Identity or IMSI)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate identification of handset and service provider as taught by Kallio to the voice and data network system as disclosed by Rogalski for purpose of authenticating a subscriber using type of services provided by network.

Consider **claim 2 as applied to claim 1 above**, Kallio discloses the first wireless network is operated by a first provider, wherein the system further comprises a second wireless network operated by a second provider, and wherein the at least one digital cordless handset is further operative to interoperate between the first wireless network and the second wireless network (FIG. 1, par. 0024-0025, 0029 for GSM and WLAN networks).

Consider **claim 3**, Rogalski as modified by Kallio discloses the claimed invention **as applied to claim 1 above**, and in addition Rogalski discloses the at least one digital cordless handset is operative to communicate with the wired data network via the at least one wireless access point (FIG. 5 for PSTN network 520 and lines 3-7 of par. 0025).

Consider **claim 7**, Rogalski as modified by Kallio discloses the claimed invention **as applied to claim 1 above**, and in addition Rogalski discloses the unregulated wireless connection is an IEEE 802.11b connection (lines 11-12 of par. 0029, “the gateway uses the 802.11b standard.”).

Consider **claim 8**, Rogalski clearly discloses a method of providing voice and data services over a wired data network, comprising:

detecting a digital cordless handset in range of a wireless access point over an unregulated wireless connection, wherein the wireless access point is wired to the wired data network, wherein the wired data network is operative to provide information of at least one subscriber to voice and data services (FIGs. 1 and 5, par. 0023-0024 for digital cordless handsets 560 and 570, wireless access point 510, wired data with voice service network 530 and consider data gateway 510 as a subscriber's gateway; also lines 7-9 of par. 0031 should be considered as indication of using unregulated wireless connection of WLAN);

However, Rogalski fails to clearly disclose providing incoming and outgoing calls from the digital cordless handset through the wired data network, based on a verification of a subscriber and service provider identification, wherein the cordless handset comprises the subscriber identification and the associated service provider identification.

In the same filed of endeavor, Kallio discloses providing incoming and outgoing calls from the digital cordless handset through the wired data network (par. 0025, lines 27-42), based on a verification of a subscriber and service provider identification (par. 0025, lines 35-42 and 51-52 for LAC identifier which is considered as service provider identifier and AuC for identifying the subscriber; par. 0029 WMC for confirming the identify of the user), wherein the cordless handset comprises the subscriber identification and the associated service provider identification (par. 0024 for SIM card or chip for confirming the identity of the user; par. 0007 for multi-mode phone to access DECT; it is well-known in the art that the SIM card includes (stores) the associated service provider identification (International Mobile Subscriber Identity or IMSI)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate identification of handset and service provider as taught by Kallio to the voice and data network system as disclosed by Rogalski for purpose of authenticating a subscriber using type of services provided by network.

Consider **claim 9**, Rogalski as modified by Kallio discloses the claimed invention **as applied to claim 8 above**, and in addition Rogalski discloses obtaining identification information from the digital cordless handset; and determining the voice and data services to provide to the digital cordless handset over the wired data network based upon the obtained identification information (lines 4-6 of par. 0024, "VDG 510 automatically determines if a PSTN connection is available and determines if broadband network 530 supports data only or data with voice services" and par. 0025; it is inherently taught an well known that each cordless has a unique identification information otherwise the VDG 510 could not recognize terminals 560 and 570).

Consider **claim 13 as applied to claim 8 above**, Kallio discloses the unregulated wireless connection is a bluetooth connection (par. 0023).

8. **Claims 4-6** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Rogalski et al. (U.S. Patent Application Pub. # 2004/0141484 A1)** (hereafter Rogalski) in view of **Kallio (U.S. Patent Application Pub. # 2002/0147008 A1)** further in view of **Baek (U.S. Patent # 6081726)**.

Consider **claim 4 as applied to claim 3 above**, Rogalski as modified by Kallio disclose the claimed invention except the at least one digital cordless handset is operative to switch between a first wireless access point and a second wireless access point during voice or data communication.

In the same field of endeavor, Baek discloses the at least one digital cordless handset is operative to switch between a first wireless access point and a second wireless access point during voice or data communication (FIG. 1 and lines 47-54 of col. 4, "the first terminal 151 on line with that of the first telephone 131 through the first public base station 141 can keep the communication through the second public base station 142 without any interruption. As a result, a handover service is furnished to have no interruption of communication…").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to incorporate the handover service for cordless phone as taught by Baek to the network system disclosed by Rogalski as modified by Kallio for purpose of continuing communication when the user moves from one network to another. The proper motivation is to provide a digital cordless telephone system with incoming call and handover services (Baek lines 35-37 of col. 1).

Consider **claim 5 as applied to claim 4 above**, Baek discloses switching between the first wireless access point and the second wireless access point comprises exiting a wireless transmission area of the first wireless access point and entering a wireless transmission area of the second wireless access point (FIG. 1 and lines 27-54 of col. 4, "When the subscriber of terminal 151 on line is out of the service area of base station 141 and moves into the service area of the base station 142…").

Consider **claim 6 as applied to claim 4 above**, Baek discloses the at least one digital cordless handset contains identification information, and wherein the identification information is transferred from the first wireless network to the wired data network (lines 56-55 of col. 1, "A central control unit stores information concerning the respective cordless telephones…" the stored information of cordless is considered as identification information). In addition, Rogalski discloses where it is determined what voice and data services to provide based on the identification information (lines 4-6 of par. 0024, "VDG 510 automatically determines if a PSTN connection is available and determines if broadband network 530 supports data only or data with voice services" and par. 0025; it is inherently taught that each cordless has a unique identification information otherwise the VDG 510 could not recognize the terminal 560 and 570).

9. **Claims 10-12 and 22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Rogalski et al. (U.S. Patent Application Pub. # 2004/0141484 A1)** (hereafter Rogalski) in view of **Kallio (U.S. Patent Application Pub. # 2002/0147008 A1)** further in view of **Moore, JR. (U.S. Patent Application Pub. # 2003/0039242 A1)** (hereafter Moore).

Consider **claim 10 as applied to claim 8 above**, Rogalski as modified by Kallio discloses establishing a VoIP session between the digital cordless handset and the wired network through wireless access point (see FIG. 5 and lines 4-8 of par. 0029 of Rogalski)

However, Rogalski as modified by Kallio fails to explicitly disclose the details of assigning an IP address to the digital cordless handset upon detecting the handset being in range of the wireless access point, and wherein providing for incoming and outgoing calls comprises establishing a VoIP session between the digital cordless handset and the wired data network through wireless access point.

In the same field of endeavor, Moore clearly discloses assigning an IP address to the digital cordless handset upon detecting the handset being in range of the wireless access point (FIG. 5 and lines 1-3 of par. 0040, "handset 10 may dynamically assigned a new IP address on IP subset of the VoIP gateway 20."), and wherein providing for incoming and outgoing calls comprises establishing a VoIP session between the digital cordless handset and the wired data network through wireless access point (lines 1-3 of par. 0004, "allow a subscriber to have incoming and outgoing calls placed from his handset…"; lines 4-7 of par. 0018, "If the mobile handset is within range of the local wireless network of the VoIP gateway, it acts as a cordless phone and uses the VoIP gateway to make and receive calls").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to combine the method of assigning IP address and make incoming and outgoing call from the cordless phone as taught by Moore to the wireless access point disclosed by Rogalski as modified by Kallio for purpose of using voice-over-IP technology in a home wireless network.

Consider **claim 11 as applied to claim 10 above**, Moore further discloses providing for incoming calls comprises detecting an IP address corresponding to a telephone number that is called and wherein the VoIP session is established with the digital cordless handset that is assigned the IP address corresponding to the telephone number (FIG. 5 and lines 1-3 of par. 0035).

Consider **claim 12 as applied to claim 10 above**, Moore further discloses providing for outgoing calls comprises establishing the VoIP session when receiving a dialed number at the digital cordless handset and completing a call to the party corresponding to the dialed number (FIG. 5 and lines 1-3 of par. 0035)

Consider **claim 22 as applied to claim 12 above**, Moore further discloses the unregulated wireless connection is an IEEE 802.11b connection (line 3 of par. 0023).

10. **Claims 14-21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Jones et al. (U.S. Patent # 6404764 B1)** (hereafter Jones) in view of **Rogalski et al. (U.S. Patent Application Pub. # 2004/0141484 A1)** (hereafter Rogalski) further in view of **Kallio (U.S. Patent Application Pub. # 2002/0147008 A1)**.

Consider **claim 14**, Jones clearly shows and discloses a system for providing voice and data services over a wired data network, the system comprising:

a broadband residential gateway comprising (FIG. 2 for network premises gateway 10) a first network device for communicating with the wired data network (FIG. 2 for internet access device 14; lines 23-24 of col. 2), a second network device for providing a communications link to at least one wired network device over a local wired network (see FIG. 2 for gateway 10 and FIG. 4 for network backbone as the second network device; and different interfaces such as Ethernet and 1394 interface connected to local backbone as wired network), and a wireless access point operative to provide wireless access to the wired data network over a wireless connection (FIG. 2 for wireless network provided for digital handset 30 from network disclosed in lines 6-9 of col. 3 and lines 3-6 of col. 10; wireless network for analog cordless telephone 28 disclosed in lines 59-57 of col. 2), wherein the wired data network is operative to provide information of at least one subscriber to the voice and data services (FIG. 4. col. 3 lines 15-37 for gateway 10) ; and

at least one digital cordless handset for communicating with the wireless access point via the wireless connection in order to provide the voice and data services (FIG. 2 for wireless network provided for digital handset 30).

However, Jones fails to explicitly the wireless connection is an unregulated wireless connection; and wherein the wired data network is operative to provide information of at least one subscriber to voice and data services.

In the same field of endeavor, Rogalski clearly show the wireless connection is unregulated wireless connection (lines 3-14 of par. 0029, 802.11b uses unregulated/unlicensed frequency band 2.4 GHz; lines 7-9 of par. 0031); and wherein

the wired data network is operative to provide information for at least one subscriber to voice and data services (FIG. 5, par. 0023-0024 for broadband data with voice service 530).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to incorporate unlicensed wireless connection as taught by Rogalski to the wireless connection between wireless digital handsets (FIG. 2 for wireless handsets 30) and wireless access point (FIG. 2 gateway 10) disclosed by Jones for purpose of using WLAN standard for voice and data communication.

However, Jones as modified by Rogalski fails to explicitly disclose the communication is based on a verification of a subscriber and service provider identification, wherein the cordless handset comprises the subscriber identification and the associated service provider identification.

In the same filed of endeavor, Kallio the communication is based on a verification of a subscriber and service provider identification (par. 0025, lines 35-42 and 51-52 for LAC identifier which is considered as service provider identifier and AuC for identifying the subscriber; par. 0029 WMC for confirming the identify of the user), wherein the cordless handset comprises the subscriber identification and the associated service provider identification (par. 0024 for SIM card or chip for confirming the identity of the user; par. 0007 for multi-mode phone to access DECT; it is well-known in the art that the SIM card includes (stores) the associated service provider identification (International Mobile Subscriber Identity or IMSI)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate identification of handset and service provider as taught by Kallio to the voice and data network system as disclosed by Jones as modified by Rogalski for purpose of authenticating a subscriber using type of services provided by network.

Consider **claim 15**, Jones and modified by Rogalski as modified by Kallio discloses the claimed invention **as applied to claim 14 above**, and in addition Jones discloses the at least wired network device comprises at least one digital wired handsets for communicating with the wired data network in order to provide the voice and data services (FIG. 2 for digital IP devices 30 and lines 23-25 of col. 5, "the IP telephony H.323 engine 36 may be used to support wired or wireless IP devices 30 which support VoIP functionality").

Consider **claim 16**, Jones and modified by Rogalski as modified by Kallio discloses the claimed invention **as applied to claim 15 above**, and in addition Jones discloses the local
wired network comprises a home phone networking alliance network (FIG. 1 and lines 14-5 of col. 2, "The whole-home IP telephone system with VoIP functionality and associated internet connectivity is embedded in the network premises gateway 10…"; or FIG. 2 for digital IP devices 30 and lines 23-25 of col. 5, "the IP telephony H.323 engine

36 may be used to support wired or wireless IP devices 30 which support VoIP functionality").

Consider **claim 17**, Jones and modified by Rogalski as modified by Kallio discloses the claimed invention **as applied to claim 15 above**, and in addition Jones discloses the wired data network is operative to generate a telephone call directed toward the broadband residential gateway and wherein the telephone call may be answered on the at least one digital cordless handset or the at least one digital wired handset (FIG. 2 and lines 23-27 of col. 4, "The telephony crossbar 42 is the "spine" of the telephony subsystem 34; the telephony crossbar 42 couples the telephony manager 38 and the POTS interface 40 to each other. The telephony crossbar 42 is also a router for all telephony calls, PSTN and VoIP, alike.")

Consider **claim 18**, Jones and modified by Rogalski as modified by Kallio discloses the claimed invention **as applied to claim 15 above**, and in addition Jones discloses the broadband residential gateway is operative to generate a telephone call directed toward the wired data network and wherein the telephone call may be initiated on the at least one digital cordless handset or the at least one digital wired handset (lines 14-26 of col. 10, "when placing an outgoing call from the digital wireless handsets 30… The digital signals are translated to a format compatible for a network used in completing the outgoing call at the network premises gateway 10, wherein the network is… an internet 12 for VoIP-based calls.").

Consider **claim 19**, Jones and modified by Rogalski as modified by Kallio discloses the claimed invention **as applied to claim 15 above**, and in addition Jones discloses the system further comprises a directory information database and wherein at least one the digital cordless handset or the at least one digital wired handsets is operative to access directory information provided by the directory information database (lines 12-18 of col. 9, "the network premises gateway 10 performs… and references the name and IP address against a database contained in the system controller and memory component 32 of the network premises gateway 10 in order to do a name look-up.")

Consider **claim 20**, Jones and modified by Rogalski as modified by Kallio discloses the claimed invention **as applied to claim 14 above**, and in addition Rogalski discloses the at least one digital cordless handset transmits a user identifier to the wired data network and wherein the system further comprises a restriction database of the wired network that applies rules to telephone calls of the at least one digital cordless handsets based on a user of the at least one digital cordless handset (FIG. 8 and lines 1-3 of par. 0069 and par. 0070 for restriction definition in database of firewall; user identifier is inherently taught since every device has to have a type of recognized ID to access to a network).

Consider **claim 21**, Jones and modified by Rogalski as modified by Kallio discloses the claimed invention **as applied to claim 14 above**, and in addition Rogalski

discloses the system further comprises a web interface at a personal computer linked to the wired data network, wherein the web interface provides for entry of administrative information for providing the voice and data services over the wired data network (FIG. 6 and par. 0061, "With the interconnection between the gateway and the PC (i.e., wired data terminal 540), the processing power of the PC can be leveraged to enhance the functions of the cordless telephony system in a way that would otherwise be impractical or cost prohibitive.").

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

a. Lu et al. (U.S. Patent # 6829477 B1) disclose Private multiplexing cellular network.

b. Li et al. (U.S. Patent # 6876852 B1) disclose Integrated cable and cellular network

c. McIntosh et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 20030139180) disclose Private cellular network with a public network interface and a wireless local area network extension.

13. Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to** (571) 273-8300 **or mailed to**:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Allahyar Kasraian whose telephone number is (571)

270-1772. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Rafael Pérez-Gutiérrez can be reached on (571) 272-7915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 571-272-4100.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

/Allahyar Kasraian/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

A.K./ak

/Rafael Pérez-Gutiérrez/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

March 10, 2009